



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/655,324	09/04/2003	W. Doyle Kitchen JR.	1422-0001	5844
7590 03/10/2009				
Steven W. Smith Attorney at Law 7237 Birchwood Drive Dallas, TX 75240			EXAMINER NAJEE-ULLAH, TARIQ S	
			ART UNIT 2456	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 03/10/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/655,324

**Applicant(s)**

KITCHEN, W. DOYLE

**Examiner**

TARIQ S. NAJEE-ULLAH

**Art Unit**

2456

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 14-30, 37 and 38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 14-30, 37 and 38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

1. This Office action has been issued in response to Applicant's Amendment filed December 22, 2008. Claims 1-12, 14-30 and 37-38 are pending in the case. Claims 13 and 31-36 have been cancelled. Claim 38 has been added. Claims 1-6, 8, 11-12, 16, 18-19, 21-24, 26, 28-29 and 37 have been amended.

***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-30 and 32-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application Publication 2003/0191969 to Katsikas in view of US Patent 6,412,014 to Ryan have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 5-9, 13, 24, 26, 32 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Katsikas-Ryan as applied to claims 2, 12, 22-23, and 33 above, and further in view of US Patent 6,128,602 to Northington et al (Northington hereinafter) have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-4, 10-12, 14-22, 27-30 and 37-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application Publication 2004/0177120 to Kirsch in view of Request for Comments 1912 from the Network Working Group of Pennsylvania State University released in February 1996 to D. Barr (Barr herinafter).

Regarding claims 1, 12, 22, 28, 37, and 38, Kirsch teaches **a system for denying or allowing delivery of an incoming electronic mail (e-mail) message from a source e-mail server, said incoming message indicating a source e-mail server identity and a source domain associated with the source e-mail server** (fig. 1 shows a system that validates a sender's email via a 3<sup>rd</sup> Party server with a central database; fig. 2 illustrates a system of sender email address validation); **a central e-mail server registry database for storing information regarding combinations of e-mail server identities and associated domains that are authorized to send e-mail messages over the Internet** (fig. 1 shows a system that validates a sender's email via a 3<sup>rd</sup> Party server with a central database; fig. 2 illustrates a system of sender email address validation; fig. 5a and 5b shows the domain and IP address associated with the sender), **wherein each e-mail server identity in the registry includes both an e-mail server name as defined in the e-mail server's Domain Name Services (DNS) entry and an Internet Protocol (IP) address** (pg. 1, par. 12 teaches a digital signature in the e-mail message combined with the domain name associated with the final IP address in the e-mail message); **means for a receiving e-mail server to access information from the registry database to determine whether the combination of the source e-mail server identity and the associated source domain included in the incoming**

**e-mail message is an authorized combination** (pg. 1, par. 12 teaches a digital signature in the e-mail message combined with the domain name associated with the final IP address in the e-mail message; pg. 2, par. 13-14 teaches checking identification information against a central database); **and means for allowing delivery of the incoming e-mail message if the combination included e-mail message is an authorized combination** (pg. 1, par. 12 teaches a digital signature in the e-mail message combined with the domain name associated with the final IP address in the e-mail message; pg. 2, par. 13-14 teaches checking identification information against a central database; pg. 2, par. 13-14 also teaches a whitelist, i.e. means for allowing delivery of the incoming e-mail message if the combination is authorized), **and denying delivery of the incoming e-mail message if the combination included in the incoming e-mail message is not an authorized combination** (pg. 1, par. 12 teaches a digital signature in the e-mail message combined with the domain name associated with the final IP address in the e-mail message; pg. 2, par. 13-14 teaches checking identification information against a central database; pg. 2, par. 13-14 also teaches a blacklist, i.e. means for denying delivery of the incoming e-mail message if the combination is not authorized).

While Kirsch introduces the concept of blacklists and whitelists regarding “true sender” identification of an e-mail sender, Kirsch does not explicitly teach determining how the DNS name and IP address and the associated source domain are authorized combinations or not. Barr teaches determining how the DNS name and IP address and the associated source domain are authorized combinations or not (Barr, pg. 1-3, sec.

2.1; Barr teaches forward confirmed reverse DNS validation through matching the forward and reverse combinations of the DNS domain and IP address, *"Make sure your PTR and A records match. For every IP address, there should be a matching PTR record in the in-addr.arpa domain. If a host is multi-homed, (more than one IP address) make sure that all IP addresses have a corresponding PTR record (not just the first one). Failure to have matching PTR and A records can cause loss of Internet services similar to not being registered in the DNS at all. Also, PTR records must point back to a valid A record, not a alias defined by a CNAME. It is highly recommended that you use some software which automates this checking, or generate your DNS data from a database which automatically creates consistent data")*.

To provide Kirsch's method of filtering e-mail messages with a method of forward confirmed reverse DNS validation would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, in view of the teaching of Barr, since all the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change to their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded nothing more than predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

Regarding claim 2, Kirsch-Barr teaches the invention as described in claim 1 above including, **wherein the information regarding combinations of e-mail server identities and associated domains includes a status of each e-mail server's registration with the registry database** (Kirsch, fig. 2, 62 teaches true sender's reputation, i.e. status is good or not), **said status indicating whether each server is**

**registered** (Kirsch, fig. 2, 30, 32 teaches sender being part of, i.e. registered on recipient's whitelist or blacklist, i.e. registered acceptance and denial lists), **whether the server's associated domains are registered** (Kirsch, fig. 2, 30, 32 teaches sender being part of, i.e. registered on recipient's whitelist or blacklist, i.e. registered acceptance and denial lists; fig. 2, 62 teaches true sender's reputation, i.e. status is good or not), **and whether the registrations are in good order** (Kirsch, fig. 2, 30, 32 teaches sender being part of, i.e. registered on recipient's whitelist or blacklist, i.e. registered acceptance and denial lists; fig. 2, 62 teaches true sender's reputation, i.e. status is good or not; Furthermore, Barr teaches forward confirmed reverse DNS validation through matching the forward and reverse combinations of the DNS domain and IP address, i.e. whether domain registrations are valid or not; pg. 1-3, sec. 2.1).

Regarding claim 3, Kirsch-Barr teaches the invention as described in claim 2 above including, **wherein the means for allowing delivery and denying delivery of the incoming e-mail message includes means for denying delivery if the combination is not registered** (pg. 1, par. 12 teaches a digital signature in the e-mail message combined with the domain name associated with the final IP address in the e-mail message; pg. 2, par. 13-14 teaches checking identification information against a central database; pg. 2, par. 13-14 also teaches a blacklist, i.e. means for denying delivery of the incoming e-mail message if the combination is not authorized), **or if the registration of the source domain is not in good order** (Kirsch, fig. 2, 30, 32 teaches sender being part of, i.e. registered on recipient's whitelist or blacklist, i.e. registered acceptance and denial lists; fig. 2, 62 teaches true sender's reputation, i.e. status is

good or not; Furthermore, Barr teaches forward confirmed reverse DNS validation through matching the forward and reverse combinations of the DNS domain and IP address, i.e. whether domain registrations are valid associations or not; pg. 1-3, sec. 2.1).

Regarding claim 4, Kirsch-Barr teaches the invention as described in claim 2 above including, **wherein the means for allowing delivery and denying delivery of the incoming e-mail message includes means for denying delivery if the source domain is not associated with the source e-mail server identity** (pg. 1, par. 12 teaches a digital signature in the e-mail message combined with the domain name associated with the final IP address in the e-mail message; pg. 2, par. 13-14 teaches checking identification information against a central database; pg. 2, par. 13-14 also teaches a blacklist, i.e. means for denying delivery of the incoming e-mail message if the combination is not authorized fig. 2, 62 teaches true sender's reputation, i.e. status is good or not; Furthermore, Barr teaches forward confirmed reverse DNS validation through matching the forward and reverse combinations of the DNS domain and IP address, i.e. whether domain registrations are valid associations or not; pg. 1-3, sec. 2.1).

Regarding claim 10, Kirsch-Barr teaches the invention as described in claim 2 above including, **wherein the means for allowing delivery and denying delivery of the incoming e-mail message also includes means for denying delivery if the source e-mail server is not registered with the central registry database** (pg. 1, par. 12 teaches a digital signature in the e-mail message combined with the domain



name associated with the final IP address in the e-mail message; pg. 2, par. 13-14 teaches checking identification information against a central database; pg. 2, par. 13-14 also teaches a blacklist, i.e. means for denying delivery of the incoming e-mail message if the combination is not authorized fig. 2, 62 teaches true sender's reputation, i.e. status is good or not; Furthermore, Barr teaches forward confirmed reverse DNS validation through matching the forward and reverse combinations of the DNS domain and IP address, i.e. whether domain registrations are valid associations or not; pg. 1-3, sec. 2.1), **or if the source e-mail server's registration is not in good standing** (pg. 1, par. 12 teaches a digital signature in the e-mail message combined with the domain name associated with the final IP address in the e-mail message; pg. 2, par. 13-14 teaches checking identification information against a central database; pg. 2, par. 13-14 also teaches a blacklist, i.e. means for denying delivery of the incoming e-mail message if the combination is not authorized fig. 2, 62 teaches true sender's reputation, i.e. status is good or not; Furthermore, Barr teaches forward confirmed reverse DNS validation through matching the forward and reverse combinations of the DNS domain and IP address, i.e. whether domain registrations are valid associations or not; pg. 1-3, sec. 2.1).

Regarding claim 11, Kirsch-Barr teaches the invention as described in claim 2 above including, **further comprising: a local registry database associated with the receiving e-mail server for downloading predefined information from the central registry database** (Kirsch, fig. 1 shows a system that validates a sender's email via a 3<sup>rd</sup> Party server with a central database; Barr, pg. 4 last paragraph teaches updating the

[domain] nameserver); **means within the receiving e-mail server for accessing the local registry database in a first attempt to determine whether the source e-mail server and source domain are registered in good standing** (Kirsch, pg. 1, par. 12 teaches a digital signature in the e-mail message combined with the domain name associated with the final IP address in the e-mail message; Kirsch, fig. 2, 30, 32 teaches sender being part of, i.e. registered on recipient's whitelist or blacklist, i.e. registered acceptance and denial lists; fig. 2, 62 teaches true sender's reputation, i.e. status is good or not; Furthermore, Barr teaches forward confirmed reverse DNS validation through matching the forward and reverse combinations of the DNS domain and IP address; pg. 1-3, sec. 2.1), **and whether the combination is an authorized combination** (Kirsch, pg. 1, par. 12 teaches a digital signature in the e-mail message combined with the domain name associated with the final IP address in the e-mail message; pg. 2, par. 13-14 teaches checking identification information against a central database; pg. 2, par. 13-14 also teaches a blacklist, i.e. means for denying delivery of the incoming e-mail message if the combination is not authorized); **and means within the receiving e-mail server for accessing the central registry database in a second attempt to determine whether the source e-mail server and source domain are registered in good standing, and whether the combination is an authorized combination** (Kirsch, pg. 1, par. 12 teaches a digital signature in the e-mail message combined with the domain name associated with the final IP address in the e-mail message; Kirsch, fig. 2, 30, 32 teaches sender being part of, i.e. registered on recipient's whitelist or blacklist, i.e. registered acceptance and denial lists; fig. 2, 62

teaches true sender's reputation, i.e. status is good or not; Furthermore, Barr teaches forward confirmed reverse DNS validation through matching the forward and reverse combinations of the DNS domain and IP address; pg. 1-3, sec. 2.1), **said second attempt being made in response to determining that the source e-mail server or source domain is not registered in the local registry database** (Kirsch, pg. 1, par. 12 teaches a digital signature in the e-mail message combined with the domain name associated with the final IP address in the e-mail message; Kirsch, fig. 2, 30, 32 teaches sender being part of, i.e. registered on recipient's whitelist or blacklist, i.e. registered acceptance and denial lists; fig. 2, 62 teaches true sender's reputation, i.e. status is good or not; Furthermore, Barr teaches forward confirmed reverse DNS validation through matching the forward and reverse combinations of the DNS domain and IP address; pg. 1-3, sec. 2.1).

Regarding claim 14, Kirsch-Barr teaches the invention as described in claim 12 above including, **further comprising denying delivery of the incoming e-mail message if the source e-mail server is not registered in the central registry database** (Kirsch, pg. 1, par. 12 teaches a digital signature in the e-mail message combined with the domain name associated with the final IP address in the e-mail message; Kirsch, fig. 2, 30, 32 teaches sender being part of, i.e. registered on recipient's whitelist or blacklist, i.e. registered acceptance and denial lists; fig. 2, 62 teaches true sender's reputation, i.e. status is good or not; Furthermore, Barr teaches forward confirmed reverse DNS validation through matching the forward and reverse combinations of the DNS domain and IP address; pg. 1-3, sec. 2.1).

Regarding claim 15, Kirsch-Barr teaches the invention as described in claim 12 above including, **further comprising denying delivery of the incoming e-mail message if the source domain is not registered in the central registry database** (Kirsch, pg. 1, par. 12 teaches a digital signature in the e-mail message combined with the domain name associated with the final IP address in the e-mail message; Kirsch, fig. 2, 30, 32 teaches sender being part of, i.e. registered on recipient's whitelist or blacklist, i.e. registered acceptance and denial lists; fig. 2, 62 teaches true sender's reputation, i.e. status is good or not; Furthermore, Barr teaches forward confirmed reverse DNS validation through matching the forward and reverse combinations of the DNS domain and IP address; pg. 1-3, sec. 2.1).

Regarding claim 16, Kirsch-Barr teaches the invention as described in claim 12 above including, **further comprising denying delivery of the incoming e-mail message if the information in the central registry database indicates that the source e-mail server or source domain do not have a registration in good standing** (Kirsch, fig. 2, 30, 32 teaches sender being part of, i.e. registered on recipient's whitelist or blacklist, i.e. registered acceptance and denial lists; fig. 2, 62 teaches true sender's reputation, i.e. status is good or not).

Regarding claim 17, Kirsch-Barr teaches the invention as described in claim 12 above including, **further comprising denying delivery of the incoming e-mail message if the source domain is not associated with the source e-mail server** (Kirsch, pg. 1, par. 12 teaches a digital signature in the e-mail message combined with the domain name associated with the final IP address in the e-mail message; pg. 2, par.

13-14 teaches checking identification information against a central database; pg. 2, par. 13-14 also teaches a blacklist, i.e. means for denying delivery of the incoming e-mail message if the combination is not authorized; Barr, pg. 1-3, sec. 2.1; Barr teaches forward confirmed reverse DNS validation through matching the forward and reverse combinations of the DNS domain and IP address).

Regarding claim 18, Kirsch-Barr teaches the invention as described in claim 12 above including, **further comprising, before receiving the incoming e-mail, the steps of: downloading from the central registry database to the receiving e-mail server predefined information from the registry database** (Kirsch, fig. 1 shows a system that validates a sender's email via a 3<sup>rd</sup> Party server with a central database; Barr, pg. 4 last paragraph teaches updating the [domain] nameserver); **and storing the downloaded information in a local registry database associated with the receiving e-mail server** (Kirsch, fig. 1 shows a system that validates a sender's email via a 3<sup>rd</sup> Party server with a central database; Kirsch, pg. 1, par. 12 teaches a digital signature in the e-mail message combined with the domain name associated with the final IP address in the e-mail message; Barr, pg. 4 last paragraph teaches updating the [domain] nameserver).

Regarding claim 19, Kirsch-Barr teaches the invention as described in claim 12 above including, **further comprising, after receiving the incoming e-mail, the steps of: accessing by the receiving e-mail server** (Kirsch, fig. 1 shows a system that validates a sender's email via a 3<sup>rd</sup> Party server with a central database; Kirsch, pg. 1, par. 12 teaches a digital signature in the e-mail message combined with the domain

name associated with the final IP address in the e-mail message; Barr, pg. 4 last paragraph teaches updating the [domain] nameserver), **the local registry database in a first attempt to determine to determine whether the source e-mail server and source domain are registered in good standing** (Kirsch, fig. 2, 62 teaches true sender's reputation, i.e. status is good or not; Furthermore, Barr teaches forward confirmed reverse DNS validation through matching the forward and reverse combinations of the DNS domain and IP address; pg. 1-3, sec. 2.1), **and whether the combination included in the incoming e-mail message is an authorized combination** (Kirsch, pg. 1, par. 12 teaches a digital signature in the e-mail message combined with the domain name associated with the final IP address in the e-mail message; pg. 2, par. 13-14 teaches checking identification information against a central database; pg. 2, par. 13-14 also teaches a blacklist, i.e. means for denying delivery of the incoming e-mail message if the combination is not authorized); **and if the source e-mail server or source domain is not registered in the local registry database, accessing by the receiving e-mail server** (Kirsch, fig. 1 shows a system that validates a sender's email via a 3<sup>rd</sup> Party server with a central database), **the central registry database in a second attempt to determine whether the source e-mail server and source domain are registered in good standing** (Kirsch, pg. 1, par. 12 teaches a digital signature in the e-mail message combined with the domain name associated with the final IP address in the e-mail message; Kirsch, fig. 2, 30, 32 teaches sender being part of, i.e. registered on recipient's whitelist or blacklist, i.e. registered acceptance and denial lists; fig. 2, 62 teaches true sender's reputation, i.e. status is good or not;

Furthermore, Barr teaches forward confirmed reverse DNS validation through matching the forward and reverse combinations of the DNS domain and IP address; pg. 1-3, sec. 2.1), and whether the combination included in the incoming e-mail message is an authorized combination (Kirsch, pg. 1, par. 12 teaches a digital signature in the e-mail message combined with the domain name associated with the final IP address in the e-mail message; pg. 2, par. 13-14 teaches checking identification information against a central database; pg. 2, par. 13-14 also teaches a blacklist, i.e. means for denying delivery of the incoming e-mail message if the combination is not authorized).

Regarding claim 20, Kirsch-Barr teaches the invention as described in claim 18 above including, **further comprising periodically refreshing the downloaded information in the local registry database** (Kirsch, fig. 1 shows a system that validates a sender's email via a 3<sup>rd</sup> Party server with a central database; Barr, pg. 4 last paragraph teaches updating the [domain] nameserver).

Regarding claim 21, Kirsch-Barr teaches the invention as described in claim 18 above including, **further comprising periodically refreshing the downloaded information in the local registry database** (Kirsch, fig. 1 shows a system that validates a sender's email via a 3<sup>rd</sup> Party server with a central database; Barr, pg. 4 last paragraph teaches updating the [domain] nameserver); **and refreshing the downloaded information in the local registry database when requested by the receiving e-mail server** (Kirsch, fig. 1 shows a system that validates a sender's email via a 3<sup>rd</sup> Party server with a central database; Barr, pg. 4 last paragraph teaches updating the [domain] nameserver).

Regarding claim 27, Kirsch-Barr teaches the invention as described in claim 22 above including, **wherein the means for responding to queries includes means for verifying that an identified domain is properly associated with an identified e-mail server** (Barr, pg. 1-3, sec. 2.1; Barr teaches forward confirmed reverse DNS validation through matching the forward and reverse combinations of the DNS domain and IP address).

Regarding claim 29, Kirsch-Barr teaches the invention as described in claim 28 above including, **wherein the central e-mail server registry database also stores an indication for each e-mail server identity indicating whether each identity's registration is in good standing** (Barr, pg. 1-3, sec. 2.1; Barr teaches forward confirmed reverse DNS validation through matching the forward and reverse combinations of the DNS domain and IP address; Kirsch, fig. 2, 30, 32 teaches sender being part of, i.e. registered on recipient's whitelist or blacklist, i.e. registered acceptance and denial lists; fig. 2, 62 teaches true sender's reputation, i.e. status is good or not), **and the means for allowing delivery and denying delivery of the incoming e-mail message also includes means for denying delivery if the source e-mail server identity does not have a registration in good standing** (Barr, pg. 1-3, sec. 2.1; Barr teaches forward confirmed reverse DNS validation through matching the forward and reverse combinations of the DNS domain and IP address; Kirsch, fig. 2, 30, 32 teaches sender being part of, i.e. registered on recipient's whitelist or blacklist, i.e. registered acceptance and denial lists; fig. 2, 62 teaches true sender's reputation, i.e. status is good or not).



Regarding claim 30, Kirsch-Barr teaches the invention as described in claim 28 above including, **wherein the central e-mail server registry database only responds to queries from registered e-mail servers** (Kirsch, pg. 1-2, par. 10-14 teaches a system that only allows messages to be received by "true senders," i.e. registered e-mail servers).

6. Claims 5-9 and 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Kirsch-Barr as applied to claims 2, 12, 22-23, and 33 above, and further in view of US Patent 6,128,602 to Northington et al (Northington hereinafter).

Regarding claim 5, Kirsch-Barr teaches the invention substantially as described in claim 2 above including, **wherein the information regarding combinations of e-mail server identities and associated domains**. Kirsch-Barr does not teach, including a country code indicating a country of origin associated with each registered domain. Northington teaches **also includes a country code** (Northington; col. 15, line 39 – col. 16, line 39), **indicating a country of origin, industry code indicating industry** (Northington; col. 15, line 39 – col. 16, line 39), **class code indicating a type of business** (Northington; col. 15, line 39 – col. 16, line 39).

Kirsch-Barr and Northington are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing computer systems information and data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use

Northington's specific characteristics with the combination of Kirsch-Barr's email system. The suggestion/motivation would have been to receive, process, and store information obtained from a plurality of computer systems (Northington, col. 2, line 45-51).

Regarding claim 6, Kirsch-Barr teaches the invention substantially as described in claim 5 above. Kirsch-Barr does not teach, **wherein the information also includes an industry code indicating an industry associated with each registered domain.** Northington teaches **wherein the information also includes a country code** (Northington; col. 15, line 39 – col. 16, line 39), **indicating a country of origin, industry code indicating industry** (Northington; col. 15, line 39 – col. 16, line 39), **class code indicating a type of business** (Northington; col. 15, line 39 – col. 16, line 39).

Kirsch-Barr and Northington are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing computer systems information and data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Northington's specific characteristics with the combination of Kirsch-Barr's email system. The suggestion/motivation would have been to receive, process, and store information obtained from a plurality of computer systems (Northington, col. 2, line 45-51).

Regarding claim 7, Kirsch-Barr teaches the invention substantially as described in claim 6 above. Kirsch-Barr does not teach, **wherein the industry code is selected from industry codes defined by the North American Industry Classification**

**System.** Northington teaches **wherein the information regarding all authorized e-mail servers and domains associated with each registered domain. also includes a country code** (Northington; col. 15, line 39 – col. 16, line 39), **indicating a country of origin, industry code indicating industry** (Northington; col. 15, line 39 – col. 16, line 39), **class code indicating a type of business** (Northington; col. 15, line 39 – col. 16, line 39).

Kirsch-Barr and Northington are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing computer systems information and data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Northington's specific characteristics with the combination of Kirsch-Barr's email system. The suggestion/motivation would have been to receive, process, and store information obtained from a plurality of computer systems (Northington, col. 2, line 45-51).

Regarding claim 8, Kirsch-Barr teaches the invention substantially as described in claim 7 above. Kirsch-Barr does not teach, **wherein the information also includes a class code indicating a type of business associated with each registered domain.** Northington teaches **wherein the information also includes a country code** (Northington; col. 15, line 39 – col. 16, line 39), **indicating a country of origin, industry code indicating industry** (Northington; col. 15, line 39 – col. 16, line 39), **class code indicating a type of business** (Northington; col. 15, line 39 – col. 16, line 39).

Kirsch-Barr and Northington are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing computer systems information and data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Northington's specific characteristics with the combination of Kirsch-Barr's email system. The suggestion/motivation would have been to receive, process, and store information obtained from a plurality of computer systems (Northington, col. 2, line 45-51).

Regarding claim 9, Kirsch-Barr teaches the invention substantially as described in claim 8 above. Kirsch-Barr does not teach **wherein the class code is selected from a group consisting of: corporate business; retail sales business; corporate .sales business; corporate professional services business; and consumer professional services business**. Northington teaches **wherein the information regarding all authorized e-mail servers and domains associated with each registered domain. also includes a country code** (Northington; col. 15, line 39 – col. 16, line 39), **indicating a country of origin, industry code indicating industry** (Northington; col. 15, line 39 – col. 16, line 39), **class code indicating a type of business** (Northington; col. 15, line 39 – col. 16, line 39).

Kirsch-Barr and Northington are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing computer systems information and data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Northington's specific characteristics with the combination of Kirsch-Barr's email system. The suggestion/motivation would have been to receive, process, and store

information obtained from a plurality of computer systems (Northington, col. 2, line 45-51).

Regarding claim 23, Kirsch-Barr teaches the invention as described in claim 22 above including, **wherein the e-mail server registry database also stores information regarding the registration status of each registered e-mail server.** Kirsch-Barr does not teach storing domain, and information regarding each registered domain's country, industry, and business class. Northington teaches **and domain, and information regarding each registered domain's country, industry, and business class** (Northington; col. 15, line 39 – col. 16, line 39). Kirsch-Barr and Northington are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing computer systems information and data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Northington's specific characteristics with the combination of Kirsch-Barr's email system. The suggestion/motivation would have been to receive, process, and store information obtained from a plurality of computer systems (Northington, col. 2, line 45-51).

Regarding claim 24, Kirsch-Barr teaches the invention substantially as described in claim 23 above including, **further comprising: means for receiving a complaint from a registered e-mail server regarding an identified source e-mail server sending an e-mail with characteristics that do not match the specified characteristics** (Kirsch; pg. 5, par. 59; Kirsch, fig. 2, 30, 32 teaches sender being part of, i.e. registered on recipient's whitelist or blacklist, i.e. registered acceptance and denial lists; fig. 2, 62 teaches true sender's reputation, i.e. status is good or not).

Kirsch-Barr does not teach **information regarding the country, industry, or business class of the e-mail's source domain**. Northington teaches electronic **information regarding the country, industry, or business class of the e-mail's domain; and means for suspending the identified source e-mail server from the registry upon determining that the source e-mail server is sending e-mails with characteristics that do not match the registered information regarding the countries, industries, or business classes** (Northington; col. 15, line 39 – col. 16, line 39).

Kirsch-Barr and Northington are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing computer systems information and data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Northington's specific characteristics with the combination of Kirsch-Barr's email system. The suggestion/motivation would have been to receive, process, and store information obtained from a plurality of computer systems (Northington, col. 2, line 45-51).

Regarding claim 25, Kirsch-Barr teaches the invention substantially as described in claim 24 above including, **further comprising means for changing the registration status of the identified source e-mail server from "good" to "review" after receiving the complaint, and while determining whether the source e-mail server is sending e-mails with characteristics that do not match the registered information regarding the countries, industries, or business classes of the source e-mail server's registered domains**. Northington teaches **wherein the information regarding all authorized e-mail servers and domains associated with each**

**registered domain. also includes a country code** (Northington; col. 15, line 39 – col. 16, line 39), **indicating a country of origin, industry code indicating industry** (Northington; col. 15, line 39 – col. 16, line 39), **class code indicating a type of business** (Northington; col. 15, line 39 – col. 16, line 39).

Kirsch-Barr and Northington are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing computer systems information and data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Northington's specific characteristics with the combination of Kirsch-Barr's email system. The suggestion/motivation would have been to receive, process, and store information obtained from a plurality of computer systems (Northington, col. 2, line 45-51).

Regarding claim 26 Kirsch-Barr teaches the invention substantially as described in claim 22 above. Kirsch-Barr does not teach **wherein the means for responding to queries includes means for determining whether an identified e-mail server or domain is registered, whether the identified e-mail server or domain is registered in good standing, and whether the identified domain possesses defined characteristics regarding the country, industry, and business class of the identified domain.** Northington teaches **wherein the information regarding all authorized e-mail servers and domains associated with each registered domain. also includes a country code** (Northington; col. 15, line 39 – col. 16, line 39), **indicating a country of origin, industry code indicating industry** (Northington; col.

15, line 39 – col. 16, line 39), **class code indicating a type of business** (Northington; col. 15, line 39 – col. 16, line 39).

Kirsch-Barr and Northington are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing computer systems information and data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Northington's specific characteristics with the combination of Kirsch-Barr's email system. The suggestion/motivation would have been to receive, process, and store information obtained from a plurality of computer systems (Northington, col. 2, line 45-51).

### ***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: US 7,313,691 to Bantz et al; US 7,249,175 to Donaldson.
8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of



the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TARIQ S. NAJEE-ULLAH whose telephone number is (571)270-5013. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30 - 6:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on (571) 272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

T. N.  
/Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2456